



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/676,186	09/29/2000	Johan Kiessling	026125-069	9330

7590 03/22/2004

Ronald L. Grudziecki, Esquire  
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1410  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

SHARMA, SUJATHA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2684

17

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/676,186

Applicant(s)

KIESSLING ET AL.

Examiner

Sujatha Sharma

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6,9,10,15,17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Vatanen [WO 99/01848] in view of Liljeqvist [WO 97/50207].

Regarding claims 1,9 and 17-20, Vatanen discloses a method of secure session set up between the application control server and the SIM card connected to the terminal device. Vatanen further discloses a method of establishing an agreement proposal for a secure transaction from the server to a security adapter connected to the network (see page 6, lines 3-37, Fig.2). Vatanen further discloses a method of activating a signing application, sending the signed data from the communication device to the security adapter, verifying the signature for the data and sending the verified signed data to the server for execution of the transaction (see page 3, lines 10-25, page 4, lines 21-34 and Fig.2).

Vatanen however does not disclose a method wherein the security adapter is residing on the network distinctly from the server.

Art Unit: 2684

Liljeqvist teaches a method for secure Internet communication where the security module resides in the network distinctly from the server. See page 2, lines 5-15, page 4, line 20 – page 5, line 18, page 8, line 9 – page 10, line 11. This method provides no dependency on a particular server and is flexible in that it can meet different levels of security.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Liljeqvist to Vatanen in order to provide more flexibility while meeting different levels of security (see page 13, lines 5-15).

Regarding claim 2, Vatanen further discloses a method where the information browsing (see page 1, lines 8-18) is further initiated by the communication device where the information is transferred over the network between the communication device and the application server (see page 6, lines 3-10).

Regarding claims 3 and 6, Vatanen further discloses a method of sending a request requiring secure transaction of data from the communication device (see page 6, lines 11-20).

Regarding claim 4, Vatanen further discloses a method of sending sign request into at least one message and sending the said message from the security adapter to the smart card in the communication device to initiate the signing application and displaying the details of the transaction and a prompt for an accept on the communication device (see page 6, line 3 – page 7, line 3 and page 7, lines 22-36 and Fig.2).

Regarding claims 5,10, Vatanen further discloses the use of a program/algorithm with a secret/private key for activating and closing of the signing application (see page 3, lines 1-25 and page 4, lines 21-34),

Regarding claim 15, Vatanen further discloses the communication device to be a mobile phone with transmitting and receiving capability (see Figs.1, summary of invention).

1. Claims 7,8,11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vatanen [WO 99/01848] and Liljeqvist [WO 97/50207] in view of Geiger [US 6,463,534] and further in view of Sandgren [WO 98/57511].

Regarding claims 7 and 11, Vatanen as treated in claims 1 and 9 does not disclose the use of a WAP protocol for data transfer and the use of SMS messaging and the signing application a SIM application toolkit application.

Geiger in the same field of endeavor teaches the use of WAP protocol for data transfers. See col. 2, lines 49-55. Geiger also teaches the use of SMS messaging for transfer of messages. See col.10, lines 1-29.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the teachings of Geiger to modified Vatanen to use the WAP protocol in order to use the mobile device for a world wide communication network such as the internet. Vatanen further modified with Geiger's teaching does not disclose the use of SIM application toolkit.

Sandgren in the same filed of endeavor teaches the use of SIM application toolkit to lock or unlock the signing application on the SIM card. See summary of invention and page 3, lines 10-28.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the teachings of Sandgren to the modified Vatanen's invention in order to enhance the security of the usage of the SIM card especially in using the SIM cards for secure transmissions such as banking.

Sandgren further teaches the use of SMS/USSD messaging between the terminal device and the operator for locking/unlocking of the SIM card. See summary of invention and page 4, lines 3-30.

Regarding claim 8, Vatanen as treated in claim 7, discloses all the limitations as claimed.

However Vatanen does not explicitly disclose the method of suspending/terminating the WAP/browser application while the SIM application toolkit application for the signing application is activated.

However, it is obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, that the browser application is suspended while the authentication/signing application is initiated in order to ensure a secure transaction between the terminal device and the application server especially in applications such as banking.

Regarding claims 12-14, Geiger further teaches a mobile telephone network, Internet for connecting to the application server and a WAP/wireless gateway connecting the mobile network to the Internet (see Fig.4 and col.11, lines 29-63).

Geiger further discloses the security adapter connected to the WAP gateway and the application server (see Fig.4).

2. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vatanen [WO 99/01848] and Liljeqvist [WO 97/50207] in view of Tsoi [US 5,425,077].

Vatanen as treated in claims 9 and 15 does not disclose a method of displaying a particular icon, font or color to indicate the status of the mobile phone.

Tsoi teaches a method of displaying a visual display of the status of the mobile telephone (See col. 6, lines 1-17).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the teachings of Tsoi to modified Vatanen in order to indicate to the user the status of the communication mode especially during a secure transaction.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sujatha Sharma whose telephone number is 703-305-5298. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7.30am - 4.00pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/676,186  
Art Unit: 2684

Page 7

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Sujatha Sharma  
February 26, 2004

  
NAY MAUNG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER